

REMARKS

This Supplemental Response is filed in reply to the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 10, 2009, as well as the telephone interview that took place on May 20, 2009. Claims 1-19 are now pending in the application, although Claims 1-9 have previously been withdrawn from consideration. By the amendments herein, Applicant has incorporated the limitations of Claim 13 into Claim 10 in order to accept subject matter acknowledged as being allowable during the noted telephone interview. Also, Claim 13 is hereby cancelled and the dependency of Claim 14 changed to Claim 10. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejections as addressed further below.

Interview Summary

On May 20, 2010 a telephone interview was conducted between the undersigned and Examiner Galen H. Hauth. During the interview, the pending prior art rejection of U.S. Patent No. 6,251,318 to Arentsen et al. (**Arentsen**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,970,732 to Slaats et al. (**Slaats**). Applicant's representative argued that the Arentsen and Slaats techniques are incompatible and that each teach away from the combined teachings as argued in Applicant's response filed May 10, 2010. Further, Applicant's representative discussed the aspect of Applicant's invention, where, as recited in Claim 10, the pressure is regulated in the deaeration channel. Examiner Hauth indicated that he was interpreting the temperature regulation taught by Arentsen to read on this limitation. Applicants representative suggested amendments, as included herein that would clarify that the claim step of regulating the pressure effects the mold cavity from

the deaeration channel, an aspect of Applicants' invention that is clearly distinguish over the prior art.

Additionally, it was further discussed that as recited in Claim 13, different pressures can be independently generated. In contrast, the Arentsen disclosure has all of the deaeration channels incorporated into a single mold part. Even if different parts of the Arentsen mold were heated differently, there is simply no teaching or suggestion to heat different deaeration channels differently. What is more, Slaats only shows one conduit leading away from the deaeration channel. Thus, Slaats also does not teach different pressures in different channels.

The Examiner reserved the right to further considered the suggested amendment to Claim 10 and the limitations of Claim 13 as part of a Supplemental Response if timely filed. Accordingly, Applicants hereby submit such corresponding amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Applicant further reiterates the arguments and explanations presented in prior responses, but has refrained from including them here to minimize redundancy. As such, Pontiff fails to teach or reasonably suggest why one of ordinary skill would combine Arentsen and Slaats, nor does the addition of the teaches of Pontiff arrive at the claimed invention.

Thus, the combined teaching of Arentsen, Slaats and Pontiff fail to disclose or reasonably suggest activating a blowing agent during the introduction and heating, while also reducing the pressure inside the mold after the mold is substantially filled, as recited in amended Claim 10. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims include further aspects not taught or reasonably

Application Serial No. 10/529,950
Attorney Docket No. 294-212 PCT/US
Supplemental Response to November 10, 2009 Office Action

disclosed by the prior art. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill would not arrive at the claimed invention by combining the teachings of Arentsen, Slaats and/or Pontiff in this regard.

Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on any combination of Arentsen, Slaats or Pontiff.

Conclusion

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of Claims 10-12 and 14-19 are hereby solicited. In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or suggestions to expedite allowance of this application, he is cordially invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/tony a. gayoso/

Tony A. Gayoso

Registration No.: 37,331

Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791-4407
(516) 822-3550
TAG:
335463_1.DOC